



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,943	04/02/2004	Long-Hui Lin	LKSP0028USA	2942
27765	7590	11/28/2007		
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			EXAMINER	
			GUTIERREZ, ANTHONY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com  
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com  
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/708,943	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIN, LONG-HUI
	<b>Examiner</b> Anthony Gutierrez	<b>Art Unit</b> 2857

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anthony Gutierrez.

(3) Ding Yu Tan.

(2) Hal Wachsman.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nozoe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,777,677 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Hal Wachsman*  
HAL WACHSMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
402857

*Hal Wachsman*  
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, applicant's representative addressed that he believed that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a wafer sample would include a single die, and thus that the claimed invention was supported by the original disclosure consistent with M.P.E.P. 2163. Examiner Wachsman addressed that a properly filed affidavit may provide additional support for Applicant's position. With respect to the prior art rejection, Applicant requested to know if based on the present search if a claim drawn to include that the three methods we performed depending on the type of defect detected, would be considered allowable over the known prior art. The Examiner indicated that if fully supported by the original disclosure that this amendment may be helpful, but that he was not sure that the amendment might not have ultimately been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. Applicant also addressed that he believed the review sequence of Nozoe et al. was not consistent with the claimed limitation of mapping. The Examiner indicated that the claims were drawn to a 'mapping analysis' and that the steps that comprised the mapping analysis were met by the review sequence of Nozoe et al. The Examiners indicated that further search and consideration would be made to any formally proposed amendment.